

### Remarks

Claims 1-24 were currently pending. Cancellation of claims 1-18 and 22-24 is proposed after final, while it is also proposed to rewrite claims 19-21 as independent claims. Applicants assert that such amendments do not raise any new issues after final such that these amendments should be entered and the remarks considered. Applicants assert that the application is in condition for allowance after final as set forth more fully below. Applicants respectfully request that a Notice of Allowability be provided or that the finality of the current rejections be withdrawn.

### Interview Summary

The undersigned participated in a telephone interview with the Examiner on Dec. 19, 2005. During the interview, dependent claims 19, 20, and 21 were discussed in relation to the current rejections. Namely, it was discussed that the Nawaz references fails to account for deficiencies of Omoigui and the Microsoft publication in relation to subject matter of claims 19 and 20. It was further discussed that the Buhler reference fails to account for deficiencies of Omoigui and the Microsoft publication in relation to the subject matter of claim 21.

### 103 Rejections

Claims 12, 3, 5, 9, 10, and 12-18 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(b) as being unpatentable over Omoigui (US 6,694,3532) in view of Microsoft (The Window Interface). Claims 4, 6, 8, 11, 22, and 24 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Omoigui in view of Microsoft and further in view of Wolfe (US 6,341,305). Claims 19-20 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Omoigui in view of Microsoft and further view of Nawaz (US Pat 5,959,621). Claims 7 and 23 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Omoigui in view of Microsoft and further view of Timm (US Pat 6,055,268). Claim 21 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Omoigui in view of Microsoft and further in view of Buhler (US Pat 6,104,704).

Applicants contend that there is a lack of motivation to combine Microsoft with Omoigui as Omoigui represents that the presentation need not be active at all times but that the user is alerted to the presentation upon a particular topic of interest in the

presentation occurring. Contrary to this point, Microsoft discloses that the application that causes the dialog box to be displayed must be the active program. Thus, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the combination of Omoigui and Microsoft. However, to expedite prosecution after final, Applicants have elected to cancel all but claims 19-21 and have rewritten claims 19-21 in independent form.

Claim 19 includes recitations not disclosed by the cited combination. Namely, Nawaz was cited for its disclosure of a client computer receiving a selection of a hyperlink of a visual indication of an event occurring based on the selection of the hyperlink, an order is placed with a billing server. This disclosure is said to occur at Col. 9 and lines 14-24. Applicants respectfully disagree and contend that Nawaz falls woefully short of such disclosure. Instead, this citation in Nawaz merely discloses that multiple sources as well as the client computer itself can source information being displayed in a ticker pane. There is nothing about selection of a hyperlink to place an order with a billing server. Thus, Nawaz fails to disclose the recitations of claim 19 such that claim 19 is allowable over the cited combination.

Claim 20 includes recitations not disclosed by the cited combination. Nawaz was also cited in relation to claim 20 for its disclosure of a calendaring server computer, where the visual indicator comprises a hyperlink and the client computer is operative to receive a selection of the hyperlink and to create an appointment with the calendaring server in response to the selection. This disclosure is said to occur at Col. 9, lines 15-24 and col. 10, lines 29-37, and it is noted in the Office Action that Microsoft Outlook supports a calendar for scheduling events. Applicants respectfully disagree that Nawaz discloses these recitations. Instead, the citation to Nawaz at Col. 9 discloses that multiple servers and the client computer can source information for the ticker pane while Col. 10 discloses that Microsoft Outlook of the client computer can source information for the ticker pane such as placing events from a calendar onto the ticker pane. This disclosure of Nawaz is the opposite of the claim recitations, where Nawaz posts information from a calendar to the ticker pane as opposed to disclosing selecting a link from the visual indicator to then create an appointment with a calendar server. Thus, Nawaz fails to disclose the recitations of claim 20 such that claim 20 is allowable over the cited combination.

Claim 21 includes recitations not disclosed by the cited combination. Buhler was cited in relation to claim 21 for its disclosure of a notification of an event occurring including a hyperlink where the client computer is operative to receive the selection of the hyperlink and to place a telephone call. This disclosure is said to occur at Col. 3, lines 25-33. Applicants respectfully disagree that Buhler discloses these recitations. To the contrary, Buhler only discloses that a packed based transport mechanism is suitable for carrying voice or video. Buhler fails to disclose anything about a hyperlink being selected to place a telephone call. Thus, Buhler fails to disclose the recitations of claim 21 such that claim 21 is allowable over the cited combination.

Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 19- 21 is in condition for allowance after final. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 20, 2006



Jeramie J. Keys  
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC  
P.O. Box 71355  
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355  
(404) 849.2093